

REMARKS

Applicants have the following response to the Office Action of June 8, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 26-28 and 30-50 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner states that independent Claims 26-28 and 30-34 each recite that, at an end portion of the substrate, a side surface of the second layer of the input terminal portion is coplanar with a side surface of the first insulating layer. The Examiner then contends that “the original disclosure lacks an adequate description regarding how such two coplanar side surfaces could be formed at the end portion of the substrate, which requires that the (right) side surface of the second layer (208) of the input terminal portion be (vertically) aligned with the (right) side surface of the first insulating layer (205), as shown in Figs. 3 and 4 in the instant invention.”

While Applicants traverse this rejection and the Examiner’s contention, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 26-28 and 30-34 to delete “a side surface of the second layer of said input terminal portion is coplanar with a side surface of the first insulating layer,” and to recite “the gate electrode comprising aluminum” and “the pixel electrode comprising indium, zinc and oxygen.” These amended features are supported by, for example, page 10, lines 3-22 and page 19, lines 4-14 of the specification of the present application.

Applicants note that in response to the restriction requirement of January 4, 2002, Applicants elected Species 2 (i.e. the “Embodiment of Figs. 3A-3B and 4A-4B, with or without one or more of

Figs. 8, 10, 11, 12). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended continue to be included within this species. For instance, one skilled in the art reviewing the specification of the present application would understand that the present application contemplates a transparent conductive film 208 and a pixel electrode 207 comprising the materials described above and claimed herein. Further, in the specification at page 21, lines 1-2, after first introducing the Second Embodiment (Figs. 3A-4B), it is stated that “hereinafter differences from the first embodiment will be mainly described.” Hence, as the amended features are not differences from the First Embodiment, one skilled in the art would clearly understand that they are included in the Second Embodiment.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is clearly supported by the specification as filed. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Previously, the Examiner had rejected the claims under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin (US 5,825,449) with or without other references. While the Examiner has not made this rejection in the present Office Action, these rejections continue to be respectfully traversed.

In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Shin nor the other cited references disclose or suggest a second layer of the input terminal portion comprising the same material as the pixel electrode and comprising indium, zinc and oxygen, as in the amended claims of the present application.

In contrast, Shin, for example, discloses ITO patterns 6A and 6B formed on source pad 2A and gate pad 2B. See e.g. Col. 1, lines 56-60.

Accordingly, as none of the cited references disclose or suggest the device of the amended claims of the present application, the claims are patentable thereover. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed over these references.

New Claims

Applicants are also adding new Claims 51-66. Each of these claims is allowable for at least the same or similar reasons as the independent claims discussed above. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Amendment to Specification

Applicants also noted two typographical errors in the specification at the paragraph starting on line 4 of page 19 and are correcting the specification herein. These amendments are clearly supported by the specification (for example, the chemical formulas in the paragraph), and no new matter is being added. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered and allowed.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are also submitting an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action for this application.

Conclusion


It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 10, 2006


Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 26568